

## Public seminar

### «Humanitarian practices and contemporary education»

#### (Experience of theatrical and educational activities based on organic action practice)

*Main speaker: Hans Ulrich Gumbrecht, Stanford University, Albert Guérard Professor in Literature, Emeritus; Professor of Comparative Literature and of French and Italian and, by courtesy, of German Studies; Chair of Graduate Studies, Comparative Literature.*

*Date: 12<sup>th</sup> of December, 2016.*

*Event location: State University of Management, Moscow, Russia.*

*Organized by: Antonina Rostovskaya and “TOT” Theater laboratory of method (Laboratory of stage action in management, SUM; Laboratory of stage practices, MSPU), State University of Management (Russia), Moscow State Pedagogical University (Russia).*

### Introduction.

**Antonina Rostovskaya** (founder of “TOT” Theater laboratory of method, head of Laboratory of stage action in management, State University of Management, head of Laboratory of stage practices Moscow State Pedagogical University): Hello! An event has happened after 20 years. It coincided so, that 20 years ago in this university started the course “Management thought in staging” with the support of Gennady Raschidovich Latfullin (ed. Director of department of Public policy and Law of State University of Management, Moscow). 20 years ago, when there was nothing except the attempts of transferring the ways and methods which are contained in the sphere of art, to the sphere of education. And in management, in its part which is directed towards working in uncertainty, with fundamentally Other, there are no definite, accurate techniques, there are no technologies which allow to work in this type of situations. But a way as a path, not technological, but when you can, only passing on your own, and getting your own experience, and only after that, reflexing on how you got through this uncertainty, you can tell how you managed to pass through and what allowed you to pass, what resources, what absolutely new abilities helped you to make your way through unknown, towards Other. This is a type of organizing your own action which contrasts the type, when you rely on your knowledge, experience, and universal laws. Because in the situation we are not familiar with, situation which we know nothing about, and this is obvious, we cannot rely on this things, they transform into obstacles on our way, we are starting to see the situation basing on our own structure of perception, our existentiality, which is constituted after many experienced situations. All our knowledge is limited by the boundaries of the situations we have been in. And this is how the science works – it cuts a part of reality, and the laws that are formed, work only for situations of a certain type. But the questions is, how is it possible to act in the situations that do not allow such approach? Or we are starting inevitably to repeat what we have already had in our experience, we can't see the situation as fundamentally Other, and we start to see our own reflection, reflection of our own experience and knowledge. In that sense we are seized by this type of organization of action. Best case scenario is that nothing is happening, the worst – our activity is ruined. There is only one book in the field of management and business which describes this type of experience, – since I've always been searching literature which can help adequately, precisely grasp this type of experience – “Only paranoid survive...” by Andrew Grove (founder and CEO of Intel

Corporation). He described his own experience, after he faced such situations, and how catastrophic, hard and “bloody” was the changing from one type of organizing his action (based on knowledge), to another. Since the more instruments, tools you master and follow the way of technologies, the harder it is to change your type of organizing the action. Our mind is constantly “throwing” at us things we already know, it is like a trap, but Grove says that: “I understand, that my experience can’t be given to another person, you can only go through on your own”. But this is a proof, that such way is possible. The next question is how it is possible to make that change in the type of action without paying such high price as destroying your own business, people’s lives, who are working in this business. And in fact our goal, 20 years ago, was to develop an educational model which would allow to cultivate different type of organizing an action. We call it “organic action”. And here, in the State University of Management, we can talk about “organic management”, which is uniting in itself thought, feeling and action in their momentariness. When our “head” (our consciousness), is occupied with its appropriate work of grasping the contact with the situation. This is not a subject-object relationship, not even subject-subject relationship, when we have our goal and we are trying to know what is the goal of the other person - we are exploring, investigating, doing a research, and in that sense we create knowledge about the other. And than again we are falling into the trap of science, knowledge-based, approach which is not working in the situation which is fundamentally Other. Therefore, every time we are forced to build our action precisely, accurately as far as our contact with the situation goes, without relying on our knowledge about the Other, but relying only on what is going on between me and the Other (in the contact between us). And in this point arise the questions which concern presence, perception, imagination, thinking and reflexion. These are basic things, they lie in the field of skills and competencies, they lie in the field of abilities, but which can be cultivated and mastered. Our educational model is based on theater practice, through which “TOT” Theater laboratory of method was founded, for the purpose of going through all the path and after that in reflexion to fix possible forms and techniques, which could be transferred to education.

I also want to tell you about the cultural context, because there are not many works about this topic even in philosophic literature – there is Martin Heidegger, who poses these questions, outlining the landscape; Ditmar Kamper and his work “Body, violence, pain”; and deeply respected Hans Ulrich Gumbrecht, whose book I read 10 years ago, “Production of Presence: What Meaning Cannot Convey”. And, of course, here in Russia these are Merab Mamardashvili and Alexander Pyatigorsky, but not so much by their philosophical works, as with their way of existing, their contemplation and thought. I have never seen thought being so live as with Pyatigorsky, he was an embodiment of living thought.

I think we will make the discussion after the performances, because it is always very hard to speak before getting experience of the practice. We decided to organize our seminar that way, with Hans Ulrich Gumbrecht, because he came to Moscow especially with the purpose to see our work, and because of that firstly we will show an example of our theater work, after that we will show an example of our educational work which we showed in Europe and in America, it’s in English, and after that we will present students’ works from Moscow State Pedagogical University, where this practice has been included in the obligatory part of the educational program as one of the basic courses in the Faculty of Primary Education for three years already. Last year we created 275 individual performances. They gave us all students of 1<sup>st</sup> year of the faculty and there are already 2 years of students, who completed our course in MSPU. Next step in our work – some of the students started mastering our practice for the purpose of becoming assistants in conducting the course in MSPU, since my basic goal, and what is one of the most important things for me – is to create a space, in which such people, who want to master the practice of organic action, could be educated, but not just mastering it and going to other spheres, but people who can lead other people through this path. This is for the first time, I’ve never done this before, we started that last year. And of course this is an open question – how to train people, who could pass this practice on. For the past 20 years there were few people from huge amount of students of State University of Management - here with me is Mihail Veselinov, who graduated from this university, also Igor Kalinovsky, who graduated from another university, Bauman Moscow State Technical University,

he has been working with us for 8 years already. This is quite a difficult process of entering this practice. Now two generations are “lost”, because there was no possibility for social realization and implementation in the educational processes. Only now there is some attention towards this kind of work, because existing approaches doesn’t work, and only most progressive educational managers are including such type of works in the educational process. I think Hans will also tell us a few words about similar attempts in other universities in the world, because the basic problem is – problem of institutionalization, what kind of problems can be faced in the process.

Hans, maybe you can tell a few words beforehand, because for us your coming is a real event.

**H.U.Gumbrecht:** I’m completely unprepared for that, but that seems to be the principle because we have to create Event. I told Antonina and her group over dinner yesterday that my friends in Stanford are asking me “Why are you going to Moscow?” And I couldn’t really explain that, because before coming we have just barely had 5 minutes of conversation at the Banny Colloquium last year. And after those 5 minutes I new that I wanted to come here. As a footnote, I have a good friend, a famous philosopher, Peter Sloterdijk, who this morning sent me an e-mail saying «Can you now tell me why you went to Moscow?», and I wrote him that I didn't know yet. And then he wrote me back – «You only tell me about this visit what you want to tell me», clearly presupposing that I have secret girlfriend in Moscow. Which I don't know yet. Now, what I will do, I will watch, and I will listen, and I will concentrate. And I don't know yet what after the lunch break I will have to say, which is not a normal situation of a professor, a professor always has something prepared in the morning. So today, because everything is so new, and I still have to find out whether I have a secret boyfriend or a girlfriend in Moscow. Anyway, today I would concentrate, I will use the lunch break not to eat, but to prepare something, then I will surprise you and myself with something that I have to say after lunch, so I hope that you come back after lunch. Just one footnote. You may realize that the time difference between Moscow and my home is 11 hours, so I may end up being so tired that maybe I cannot say anything after lunch break, in which case you can perfectly rely on Ksenia (e.d. Ksenia Golubovich, translator of the seminar), because I know from previous occasions that she always knows what I want to say even if I don’t say it.

*(presenting works of the laboratory)*

### **Speech of the main speaker.**

**H. U. Gumbrecht:** I want, first of all, to thank Antonina, Antonina’s group, thank Ksenia, and thank you all for being here because that is clearly a risk, I mean that most of you don’t know me and I don’t know what I can really say about this kind of performance. I’ve never done something like that, so this is clearly a risk. In the philosophy of Antonina performances have to be an event, but if you come to something where there is no guarantee that it will be good, that means that you trust me, and I want to thank you for inviting me to Moscow, because I love being in Moscow, and I wanted to thank you all for trusting me.

Especially I wanted to thank Ksenia, I cannot understand what she says, when she translates me in Russian, but that is not the first time that she translates me, and I am absolutely certain that what she translates is better than what I’m saying.

By the way I wanted to ask how many of you can understand English? It is just a different feeling to know that couple of people can understand what I have to say.

Secondly, I wanted to thank, I don't know how they call them, the actors, the performers, for, what I found absolutely amazing, the first part of this event. I'm not sure really what it is that you are doing, and because I'm not sure what it is I have no criteria. If you see an opera or a soccer game or a hockey game, which is one of my favorite sports, I have a criteria – was this good or bad. In this case I have no criteria yet, because I haven't made up my mind what it really is, and yet it was amazing, because it kept me awake, it kept me alert, and it was very very beautiful. And I have to both, give you an explanation and an apology – there was one moment when I dozed off, I admit, but this is that I came yesterday from Mexico City, and that is 24 hours flight, also Moscow is 11 hours away from my time zone, and now, for example, at home, where I'm living, in Northern California, it is 4.20 in the morning, so this is very very strange, the fact that there was only one moment, that I can remember, that I really lost it. It is quite amazing. And I want to apologize for that moment. I was very concerned, I talked to Igor (Igor Kalinovsky, participator of "TOT" Theater laboratory of method, performer in "From the life of chronopios and famas ", assistant at the Laboratory of stage practices in Moscow State Pedagogical University) this morning when we were walking to university, but it kept me awake, it kept me alert, and it was absolutely beautiful. And before I go into any explanation, I really want to thank you all of the performers for it, and I would like for those among you, who did not perform, to join me in giving them another applause. Applauses in Russia are always kind of shallow, as if people didn't really know whether they liked it or not, and I want you all to give a smashing applause as if this was Southern Italy.

I also want to apologize for not speaking Russian, I have lost the cone, and this may be the fifteenth time that I come to Moscow and I should really speak the language also because my editor Irina Prokhorova and NLO was kind enough to translate me, and my thing into Russian, and I feel really bad about not speaking the language. I can speak a couple of languages, but not Russian. And now, in year and a half I will retire, and by that time I promise or I threaten that I can speak Russian.

So now, as I was born in Germany, I am no longer a German citizen, but this is very typical for German academic to make long preliminary remarks, and now we go to the flash of what I have to say, and I give you an overview of what I want to do.

First I want to speak a little bit about my own position vis-a-vis this phenomena, I want to develop a little bit a concept that has been important for me in the last 10-15 years philosophically, that is the concept of "presence". I want in the first place to introduce the concept of "presence" for you. And then secondly based on this concept of presence give you a couple of arguments of why I think what you are doing, what Antonina is doing, what the "TOT" group is doing, what you performers are doing is really very important in the present day context. I would not say politically important because I don't like the word "political" and I also hate the fact that people in the humanities always have this strange ambition that they want to be political, I find it existentially important.

In the second part I will focus on what you have been presenting this morning and I do not make any difference between the first performance and the students' works. I will focus on three aspects – first of all, I have a historical association of what you are doing, and this is association what people are calling Medieval theater. I will explain why I have this association. In the second place I want to ask myself whether you are expressing something or you are not. I don't think that you have to express anything, I actually prefer, that you don't express anything, so I want to engage with the question whether you are expressing something or you are not, or whether you should express something or not.

And finally I'd like to focus on the question - what is the form of this kind of performance that you are doing, what is its form and how do you achieve form and that would bring me to concluding with the concept of "rhythm".

So we start with "presence". This is a repetition, you can read all that in the book that appeared in Russian 8-9 years ago, titled "Production of presence". So this is nothing new, but this is the basis. The basis is that I consider what you performed this morning a presence event. When I say "presence" what I have in mind is a complex concept, and that concept may be of four levels or four perspectives. Above all when you hear "presence" you only think of time or the present, like the present time, contemporary time. When I say "presence", and that is the first meaning, I think mainly of space. The Latin word from which "presence" etymologically comes - "pre esse" - means "to be in front". So we could say: "Ksenia pre est me" - Ksenia is close to me, she sits in front of me. And in that sense, in the spatial sense of "presence" it includes tangibility, palpability, so I can touch her, for example. My wife, unfortunately, is not present for me. I'm surrounded by two beautiful women, but it would be very nice if my wife was here, but she is about 10000 miles away, so she is not present.

Ksenia was telling me that first I should tell what I felt when I saw the performances, I will talk about that, but I will talk about that later because when I talk about that I want to have the concepts so I can explain better what I felt.

Let me go back to "presence".

So why does it matter to talk about presence? So let me explain this as my second point about presence. I think anything that we call in philosophy an «intentional object» - something we perceive and have in our mind, in our consciousness... For example, we physically perceive many many things that are not in our consciousness. For example, our body, our immune system perceive certain things that are in the environment and that are not in our mind. So an "intentional object" is something that we perceive and that becomes an object in our mind, in our consciousness. So we have double relationship with any intentional object - we have the relationship of interpretation, we can not help interpreting it. So those among you who listen to me and know English will immediately, automatically interpret the words I'm saying, but even those who don't understand a word English have that instinct, that impulse that they try to understand. And secondly with each intentional object we have a spatial relationship - we distinguish between tangibility and non-tangibility, so if we want to touch Ksenia, this is possible, but not likely with my wife in California.

My point is that the second component, the second instinct has been bracketed in occidental culture, emphatically including Russian culture since 17th - 18th century. It still happens, you can not be at a certain distance, but culturally speaking we have been exclusively focused on interpretation, on meaning, since the 18th century - we could say since Descartes. His definition of the ontology of human existence is "I think therefore I am" - "Cogito ergo sum" - that completely excludes the body. So we can say once again since the 17th-18th century, since the age of rationalism we have basically bracketed this dimension of presence. The intention of what I'm doing with this concept of "presence", and the intention of what I think "TOT" group is doing, is to bring precisely the somatic aspect of life, the body-space and all that has to do with it, back.

For example, it would be seeing your performance and only ask what it means. If you look at these beautiful performances and only ask what they mean, you don't get very far. Maybe they mean something, but sometimes I think it is nice to get rid of the question. Or if you watch a game of soccer as you will have it in Russia in 2018 and a game of American football, and ask what it means, if you forgive my language, as we say in American English "it means shit", it doesn't mean anything.

The third aspect, the most complicated one, I will make it very very short. This is for those who are interested in philosophy, it is my intuition that Heidegger, the late Heidegger, after 1945, speaks about “Being”, in German “Sein”, when Heidegger speaks about “event of truth”, “event of truth” is defined as “unconcealment of Being”. When Heidegger speaks of “Being” he doesn’t mean anything spiritual, he does not mean meaning. I think if Heidegger for example would have said “the being of this watch” – the being of this watch would be this individual watch, the materiality of this watch, as if you could see it without a perspective. Antonina sees it in one perspective, I see it in one perspective, Ksenia sees it in one perspective, everybody sees it in his own perspective. And if we could see it absolutely it would be what Kant calls “thing in it by itself”. And the “thing in it by itself” since 18<sup>th</sup> century is excluded from western philosophy. I think when Heidegger talks about “unconcealment of being” it would be this moment, when you think you can perceive something absolutely. It is always only for a short moment. But it is not the watch in general. It is this very individual watch. So the “event of truth” would be the moment, when you have the feeling like “I can see that absolutely”. And there were moments this morning in your performances, when I had this feeling. I get something, I capture something that I could circumscribe with meaning, but which in this very moment is something absolute, a form that imposes itself as absolute. So I think this is another connotation, another meaning of this conception of presence.

The fourth aspect that I briefly mentioned comes from theology and it comes from catholic Christian theology and from orthodox Christian theology – the Eucharist. The Eucharist is a production of presence. In Orthodox understanding and in Catholic understanding in the moment of transubstantiation, when the priest says in Russian, or in Latin, or in any language today: “This however is my body”, in that very moment the form of the bread and the form of the wine remains, but the substance becomes Christ’s flesh and Christ’s blood. So that when you eat that bread and drink that wine this is theophagy, you eat God, you literally eat God. And this was abandoned in the Reformation, because Luthor was saying that this is misunderstanding, this means the bread and the wine is a memory of God, is a symbol of God. If it is a symbol of God, then you don’t eat God. If it is a symbol of God, then the Eucharist is a memorization of the Last supper that Christ had with his disciples. But in Orthodox understanding and in Catholic understanding it is a presentification – each time the Eucharist happens, the Last supper becomes substantially present and God is physically present at this base, you cannot see him, but you can eat him and you can drink him. So for me, as a former (...), was the original inspiration. And once again I think with your performances you make something present and it is not quite clear, and that is the interesting thing – what you make present. So in a way with its bread and wine something is made present, but you cannot see it, you cannot see Christ’s flesh and Christ’s blood. That is the theological explanation, but something is present.

Now why it is important to bring presence back? Since the 17<sup>th</sup> century it has been bracketed in western culture, and why it is important what you are doing. I have several reasons for that. In general I would say it brings us back to plentitude of human existence. I mean there has been huge dimension of human existence that has been tendentially excluded, so you could say, with presence you bring back the plentitude of human existence. I will give you an example why it is so important – I think most of us today, even in professions that used to be physical professions, I mean bodily professions, proletarian professions, we spend our working day in a fusion of software and mind, a fuse of software and consciousness. And most professions today, even in car factory for example, you don’t really work materially anymore – you sit in front of a screen, there is a software in the computer, and there is my mind. And in reality I wouldn’t need a body, well you can say you need a body to use your hand to write on a keyboard, but even this you can do electronically, that is possible. So today, for example, somebody who works in the car producing factory does not produce that car physically, he or she sits in front of the screen, there is automatic production line, and if something goes wrong you hit the key. I say increasingly predominant form of our professions of everyday is a form which is very different from the form of older times, completely excludes the body, completely excludes presence.

The second reason is also more complex, and also more interesting. Since late 18<sup>th</sup> early 19<sup>th</sup> century the everyday (I'm always speaking of western culture, we could say western culture has become, fortunately or unfortunately, global culture today; when I say global culture I mean all the people in the world who are potentially connected with electronic communication, you can say some people in Amazonia or Madagascar are not, but I would say at least 6 billion of 7 billion people are in global culture) could be described as feel of contingency. Contingency means that every phenomena that you see could be interpreted in different ways and can have different functions. I can interpret the expression of your face like you are very interested and very concentrate, but we could also say that she is just very polite. Or are you really interested in what I'm saying, or you are interested in my American accent. So this is contingency, there is always several possibilities of interpretation of function. But it is a feel of contingency because there used to be certain things that we considered necessary and certain things that we considered impossible. So most things are contingent, but some things are necessary, used to be necessary, and some things used to be impossible.

I think we are in the process, and now I'm referring to late 20<sup>th</sup>-early 21<sup>st</sup> century, where this feel of contingency is becoming a Universe of contingency. I mean that things that used to be necessary or used to be fate are melting away, and on the other side, things that used to be impossible are melting away. To give you an example, until 10 years the sex in which you were born was considered to be necessary. If you were born with female genitals, however much you wanted to be a boy, you were a woman, and that could not be changed. Today we have the beginning of transsexual surgery, so all of the sudden the sex, with which you live is becoming an object of choice. On the other hand something that used to be impossible, and impossible means something that we can imagine but we can not associate with the humane condition, was immortality. We can imagine immortality, but we knew that humans were never immortal. I don't know whether there is much talking about that in Russia, there is certainly a lots of talking about that in my university. Immortality has become a research project for medicine today. So people can imagine today that someday people can choose immortality or you can choose – well, I want to live 270 years, or I want 320 years – you get my point. Whether this will ever come or not is not what I'm arguing, but I'm arguing that the things that are fate on the one hand, and the things that are impossible on the other hand are disappearing. That is basically a beautiful conquest of liberty, we have more liberty – you can choose sides, that is already beginning to be possible today. You can dream of making impossible possible, so that is beautiful, that is great, I'm happy about it. But at the same time I think that it is too much, I think it is too much for humane existence, I think that we are all living under condition of overcomplexity, of confusion, of having too many choices, we love those choices, but it seems to be too much.

I think this overcomplexity of life produces a desire for the body, I mean that body that has been excluded since 17<sup>th</sup> century all of the sudden, and I'm old enough to have observed that, I think it started in 70's – 80's, that the body was coming back, that the body has become object of desire. I meant in this overcomplexity we want something, as we say in English, "to hold on to". And I think there is very very interesting symptoms sociologically, and this is where I would associate your type or performance with, and that is for example, that today, I don't know about Russia, stadiums, although tickets for sports events are more expensive that they ever were, and although you can see every sport event on TV, and you see it much better than in the stadium, but stadiums are more full than ever before, certainly in US, certainly in Europe, certainly in South America. So people love to be in the stadium, I love to be in the stadium, and I love to be in the cheap seats where I am a part of a mass. Secondly, to give you another sports example, there is this phenomenon of public viewing. Soccer World Cup finals 2014, there were around 4 million people around the Brandenburg gate in Berlin, that is more than (...) Population in Berlin, and there were sociologists and they were asking – less than the half people were interested in the soccer game. So people were interested in being part of a larger group, part of a mass. And to give you the last example – you all know, although this is not a catholic country, if the Pope Francisco I is traveling and is doing open Mass there are many people there, even in Cuba, and we know that about only 1 third of the people know what is going on there, what this old man is doing and why is he

manipulating bread and wine, they don't know why, but they want to be part of the mass. A mass in that sense is very different from social class or from a community. When Marx, for example, defines a social class – these are the people who live under similar conditions of production and these are the people who have shared interests, but the body is excluded from that situation, and I think the type of group I want to describe includes the body. You want to be in the stadium with your body, you want to be a part of that mass that listens to the Pope with your body, you want to be on a rock concert with your body, you want the rock music to stimulate your body. So what this situation of overcomplexity produces is a desire of what I call “a mystical body”. And that is the last time I'm going back to theology – a mystical body is the oldest self description from the 3<sup>rd</sup> century of Christianity. The oldest self description of Christianity is to be “Christ mystical body” as Christ was gone incorporated, included the body. So my point is, this is not a religious point, that there is much more intense desire today to be part of a physical event, to be part of something like what we saw this morning, than 50 or a 100 years ago.

Once again I want to insist, this is not about religion or theology, I'm using theological concept in a secular way, I'm using theological concepts because they are from a time before the dimensional presence got eluded and this is why they are interesting. Ever since the Reformation Protestantism doesn't have theological concept that interests me, it has to be pre-Reformation, catholic or without Reformation Orthodox concept.

I want to focus on the performances this morning. I wanted to say more about my stuff but it is extremely boring for me too so I want to focus on the performances and I want to try and deal with the four points.

The first point is about what was the impression. The impression was above all, and I loved it, an impression of precariousness. When you started performing I had no clue, I had no anticipation of how it would end, and I had no anticipation of whether it would come together. This is very different from going to the theater and watching “Hamlet”, and going to the theater and watching Chekhov, and going to the theater and watching Schiller, whom I hate anyway, or watching a movie. I watch every year before Christmas and New Year, in one session the three parts of “The godfather” of Coppola, and I love it, but I know every word. So this is very different, and this is a performance that is precarious because you don't know whether it comes together and you don't know what form it has. I have a historical association, and that is what we call “medieval theater”. We should never talk about “medieval theater”, because when we say “a theater” we talk about a culture in which embodied meaning, meaning on the stage is the exception. Normally you would transmit literature by a book, but there is this one exception that's on stage – embodied literature. In the Middle Ages, I mean in the Central and Western European Middle Ages, as much as in the Eastern European Middle Ages, all communication that was not in Latin, or 90% of the communication that was not in Latin, was embodied. Medieval epic, like the epic of Classical antiquity, of Homer, there was no author called Homer, this was always being performed. And therefore what we call medieval theater is never a complete theater texts. If you read texts that people call medieval theater, there are very strange fragments of instructions to establish a situation of performance. There was no theater house, there was no theater space, so you had to constitute the theater space, and had to include the audience. So “medieval theater”, what we should never call a “theater”, is very different from modern theater, because the theater space was not guaranteed. And this was exactly what I felt this morning/ Of course I knew that there would be a performance, I knew that you were good, but it had to be constituted, and it had to be constituted for all of us. And I think that the difference with the theater, where there is a curtain, was that we were part of that, and that was the excitement. The excitement was would you, the performers, manage to constitute a form and would you manage to include us. And I felt at the best moments this morning that people here in the room were very much in the sense of what I was explaining before, a mystical body, we were together. Not that the bodies were fused, there was no sex



in the room, but we were a mystical body in the sense of being together. In the sense of being together that could never be produced by a TV, that were never produced in film, that could never be produced by something recorded, it has to be in the very moment, and it is eventness. It is eventness because it could also not happen. I mean Igor was telling me that he was not quite happy about the first performance, actually the first performance was one of my favorite, it was absolutely breathtaking. Why? Perhaps because it was precarious, because it was not so sure from the beginning, whether it would come together, but at some point it came together, and I felt completely part of it.

So, my thanks again for I think, it was my feeling for having constituted us as a mystical body, in the sense that I tried to explain, and having there given us a moment, when we could hold on to something, which I think occurs more and more seldom in present day society. We normally are not in situations where we are part of the physical presence being constituted.

Now a second point, and that second point is not critical, but maybe I will have a question. You were always announcing at the beginning that the performance was inspired by Julio Cortazar (so I was really happy about that, because he is really one of my favorite authors), or by Chekhov, or by Shakespeare and so forth. I think, and I can imagine, that this is very good for you to constitute something, to put something together - so you read a text, a novel or a play, or a poem, and you take that as a starting point for creating a performance. But I feel, for the creation of a mystical body, it is counterintuitive, because it suggests that what you are doing is about expressing a content, and you try to interpret what you are doing along the lines of expressing a content. Maybe this is what you want to do, but I actually think, and my perception was, that you are producing a presence, you were producing this community, this physical community in the room. And I think that each of us could have interpreted it in a different way, could have attributed a different meaning to it, and this (the performance) wouldn't matter. So what I think mattered, was the constitution of a community that included our bodies, a constitution of a mystical body. I think so for each of the performances. I mean I cannot believe how good the performances of the students were after 30 hours (ed. the duration of the course for the students of MSPU), I could literally not believe it. But I felt I didn't even want to know, I would probably have preferred not to know the texts of Julio Cortazar, of course you can recite for example from Shakespeare's "Hamlet", but as not everybody knows English and it may be good not to know that. Because we are all so used to interpreting the world, that once you say this is based on Shakespeare, this is based on Chekhov, this is based on whoever, you start seeing what you are doing as the expression, and I think this is, at most, a side effect. This is my second point.

Ok, maybe I am wrong, may be you want to express something, there is also nothing wrong with expressing something. But for me, it would have been more powerful, I think, without even thinking of Othello - it is one of my favorite Shakespeare's drama. I'm not saying anybody should express anything. But for your art form may be it would better not to announce it. I mean you can use it internally, but you should not announce it.

The third point is the most interesting one for me. In my view, you have done something that is very similar to a sports event. And there is nothing better for me then sports event. I mean, I spent too much money for tickets to sport events. I watch about thirteen games of American football per year. I watch thirty games of hockey per year. And you don't even know how expensive hockey tickets in the United States are. I do not watch much on TV, I go to a stadium and I love being at the stadium. What is similar about what you are doing and the sports event? Both have no meaning. The sports events have no meaning. I mean yes, there are people who interpret American football as the expression of capitalism, which is completely idiotic. Or, you know, hockey as the expression of the Russian soul, or some nonsense like that. The sports event has no meaning, in the sense that I think what you are performing has no meaning.

Now what is different? The sports event has rules. If you go to a soccer game, you know it supposes to last 90 minutes, it has two halves, and it is very clear what is a goal, and what conditions you have for a penalty shoot and so forth and so forth. So, in a sports event, it has no meaning, it is performance, but there are rules. This is why you have a referee, because the referee imposes the rules. The difference is, that what you are doing, has no rules. It is an event, because you constitute the possibility of a form while you are acting. When we are seeing you perform, we didn't know what would be the form, and nevertheless, I think, each time you produce the form. So in a sports event, it is clear that the form of basketball is different from a form of hockey, football, rugby etc. They all have their forms to get changed, but basically each one of them have a form. In your case, it is also a pure performance, but it is Event, different from a soccer game. Because it is not clear, what the form will be. You create the form, while you are performing.

Ok, now, my answer to a question or my hypothesis of how you achieve a form for this performance, if there is no pre-given set of rules, like in a sports event, or like in a concert or a play. I mean, if you perform a Shakespeare's play, or you perform Beethoven's "Ninth symphony" and you already have the score and the text, and it's clear, you don't have to achieve the performance. But in your case, precisely the less you express, the more you have to create the form. Now, my hypothesis, and this is the last complex thing I want to explain, is that the way you achieve a form in your performance, is by rhythm. Rhythm is the key word. What is rhythm? Let me first give a definition of rhythm. We call "rhythm" each phenomenon that is a solution of a problem - "How a time object, in the proper sense, can have a form?" So that is different from a dance. Because, normally, when you dance a waltz, for example, or a tango, you have already a prescribed rhythm. That is different to having to find the rhythm. I want to give you one example: if you have sex with somebody for the first time, you normally have to invent the rhythm. I mean you don't even think about inventing it. Have you ever realized? If you don't find the rhythm, it completely ruins the sexual experience. I mean the two rhythms are very very different. I would never say it in the United states of America because it's a very prudish country, but I think you are all enlightened enough in Russia to say that. So you have to create rhythm. Now what is, I was saying that rhythm is solution of the problem of how a time object, in a proper sense, can have a form. And I ask you for five more minutes of patience and then I'm done.

Now, what is that we call a form. A form is the simultaneity of the difference between self-reference and outside reference. Why are we saying this cup has a form? Because this cup points to itself, but also, by pointing to itself, it points to the rest of the world. Everything on this planet, or in this universe that is not this cup is distinguished from the cup. Or, this watch - this watch has a form and it is circle, the circle points to itself and everything outside the circle is not the watch. So everything that points to itself and at the same time at the rest of the world we call a "form". Now, when we talk about a form, we assume that the form has stability. If all of a sudden this watch magically starts to become quadrangular, and then becomes oval, and then becomes God knows what, then we will not call it a form. That's form.

So, what is a time object in a proper sense - it is everything, that can only exists in temporal unfolding. For example, language is a time object in a proper sense. I mean, it could not be condensed in one second. Any movement is a time object in a proper sense. Music - is a time object in the proper sense. And performance - is a time object in the proper sense. So how can a time object, in the proper sense, has a form, if we say a form requires stability, and the time object, in the proper sense, requires a temporal extension. I remember how I found the answer - when I randomly saw the logo of The World Exposition 2000. So, I saw a very strange logo, because it started to be a quadrangular, then it became a circle, then it became an oval, then it became just a stripe, then it became a circle again. And then I realized, that it repeated itself. That within 30 seconds or 40 seconds the same changes of form are coming over and again. And I think that this is exactly what makes a rhythm. So you dance with somebody, you do certain steps, you do them again. Or, a gymnastics, for example, do certain

movements, but they do them again. So repetition precisely gives a time object in the proper sense a form. And I think, I could say (and I don't say I am right, that is my hypothesis) that your type of performance is over - you kind of bringing it to end, you finish it, when you have found a rhythm. I don't think you planned it this way. But from a certain moment on this morning, I was observing, so when it come to an end. And I think it comes to an end when you have managed to establish a rhythm. Of course, I know you have your choreography, but I think that in the production of what you are doing, you are creating a rhythm. And what does this have to do with a mystical body? It has to do with the mystical body that your spectators become part of the rhythm. The rhythm that you create here in front of us - in several cases I was really caught into your rhythm. It was almost like when you listen to the music that you like, you start moving your body. I felt that precisely, what you managed beautifully - I would really say in each of the performances I saw this morning - was to create a rhythm. For you maybe it was a rhythm that you knew, but for us - and this is the important point, this is the concept where I want to go - it was rhythm as an Event. It was rhythm as Event we felt, we were present in your creation of a rhythm. And because we were present in your creation of the rhythm and we present in the middle, in the center, we were physically present. I felt, and I think I was not the only one, that we were part of that mystical body. That there was something to hold on to.

I want to congratulate you and I want to thank you to having "evented" and invented a beautiful art form. Of course there is similarity to the other forms of performances, but I've never seen it this way. And for example, I've never had this strong feeling that it was an Event. Maybe you knew everything you were doing every single moment, but there was this precariousness, emergence of the form that I found so very beautiful. And I want to thank you for that, and I want you to cultivate that, this Eventness. I think that it is very very important, as Igor say that you have this feeling that this time was better, this time was likely different. So this does not become like just you perform the same way each time. It should be possible for something to happen of some time it could not go so well and I think this is an important condition.

Now, I'm very happy that you are doing that not only in a Pedagogical University, but also at the University for Management. And while I'm certain that Antonina's formula is very important for people studying management. You use this space of performance for people to find out what they have to offer. Yesterday evening I was saying why Heidegger never did theater. And I stupidly said - because he had an ugly body. And Antonina immediately said that it doesn't matter. Any body can be interesting for performance, any voice can be interesting. You don't have to have a beautiful body in classical standards. For somebody who does management and have to interact with people inside the company and outside the company, to discover through performance what he or she has to offer, what is the toolkit of capabilities is very important. But I cannot really imagine a business conversation that would have the form of a performance based on rhythm. I mean, this is not a clue, I'm just interested what you have to say about that. So, once again, I think, this is extremely important for management university as a workshop and open space where the students can find out about their specific talents. And if I was a president or a rector of this school, I would if possible expand it more and more. It is also good for any kind of university to have a part of aesthetic space that can produce this practice. But I haven't understood yet how the form of performance you are producing is synchronized with what a student in business education needs. This is a question, not a criticism, I think it would be good to finish with open question. But before I finish, I want once again to thank you for bringing me to Moscow, this beautiful moment, and Ksenia, for a patient and fantastic translation.

## **Discussion.**

**Tatyan Titova** (Assistant Professor of the Department of Psychological Anthropology, MSPU): Your theory of presence is wonderful, but can it be used for the education of pre-school and primary school-age children? And your point of view, how a child grows, does he have strength already because he is a cultural creature by his birth, or is he a clean sheet (tabula rasa), or is he something average? How do you see today the lines of development of children, how do you think this should be realized in today education.

**H.U. Gumbrecht**: So many thanks for breaking the ice. I have four children and my youngest daughter had studied psychology at the University of Oregon, she just decided last month that she wants to become elementary school teacher, which I honestly think is the most important profession that exists. It is horribly badly paid in the United States, but I'm very happy she is doing that. On that basis let me give you an answer that in order to make it short is very heideggerian. I would assume that a good conception to start with for an elementary school condition that would include presence is to use the concept that Heidegger is using for "existence" that is "Dasein" in German. "Dasein" means "being there". Heidegger never uses the concept of "subject" nor of "existence" in German he uses the concept of "Dasein". That means in the first place "da" means "there" so it is a spatial particle, that means if you are "da" it always already includes the body. So that means it cannot be a Cartesian subject, it can't be just the mind. So there is always the physical condition, I would say not only as a general condition but also as a specific condition, that includes gender for example. It is always already a boy or a girl, maybe in between, but there is always the physical condition applied. In the second place the concept of "Dasein" implies that you are not in a subject-object relation to the world, and the subject is just the mind, and the mind is outside the world of objects. But it implies what Heidegger calls "ready to hand" or "being-the world", "in-the world". So somebody, who is in "Dasein" is somebody who is not outside the world, but is part of the world. You could say that this is another secularized, theological concept - you are part of the divine creation, and if you are part of the divine creation you are "in", you are always already in the world, and in no moment you are "tabula rasa" - because not only you are not "tabula rasa" because nobody really is a "tabula rasa", we know too much about genetic codes today to assume that anybody is ever "tabula rasa" - but also because from the moment you go to preschool, not only elementary school, you are already familiar with many things that you never have to learn. I'm always saying as an example in any culture child doesn't have to learn how a door functions, the door in Europe functions differently that the doors in North America if you have a door lock, but child knows that you have to turn them, and child knows that you have to put the hand on the door knob. I want to say that there is an implication of a body being there, and that the body is not a neutral body, it is a specific body, it also can be a handicapped body for example. And there is no zero start, you are already familiar with the culture that surrounds you. I do not mean of course completely, but I want to say that the implication that body is a part of what has to be educated, in that sense presence is what has to be educated, goes along with the implication that you are always already part of the world. I mean in a language for example by the time you get a child in preschool, even if you get the child after the first year there is already an impact of a certain language. So i think there is no "tabula rasa", i think the idea of "tabula rasa" came in as exaggerated idea of equality, if you presuppose the idea of "tabula rasa" then we are all equal. But I think this is part of the problem, and part of the beauty of pedagogy, that this type of abstract equality does not exist.

**Dmitry Leonenko**: If I may, I'll express my reaction to what I saw. I was surprised that Antonina, in her entry speech said that stage practice is an instrument for professional development, and in no means for personal growth. And I think, inside myself I do not agree with that statement.

**Antonina Rostovskaya** (founder of “TOT” Theater laboratory of method, head of Laboratory of stage action in management, State University of Management, head of Laboratory of stage practices Moscow State Pedagogical University ): I didn’t put it as an instrument.

**Dmitry Leonenko**: All right, but you said the phrase that it does not concern personal growth.

**Antonina Rostovskaya**: Yes, in my work I’m not focusing on personal growth.

**Dmitry Leonenko**: In my opinion, as I see it, the main effect of this practice is that it provides personal growth. And the second thing that I want to mention, calling the works, which were presented by the students, “performance” is a mistake. The difference between these works and “From the life of fams and chronops”, and master-course on “Othello” is huge, they are in very different genres, although all of them are in the form of a scenario action. And the difference is precisely in that the performance is directed to the audience, it is created for the spectator, and the students' works are presenting the personality, the identity of the person who thought of the idea and with the help of the pedagogues created this stage work. So I think it is very important to understand that this is a unique practice for personal growth. And it can not be judged from the point of view of a show or some other action which is created for the spectator. There are just similarities of the form. It is a representation of a human, in terminology of Heidegger “being there” or "presence" of a specific person, that is the main value of this practice. And I think that is the main perspective and area of using the practice in education. Thank you!

**Antonina Rostovskaya**: Thank you very much Dmitry! I think students should answer themselves what the result of this work is. Since I always say what I can only presuppose. I have aspects and focuses which are important for me and for the work I’m doing - creating a very definite path of opportunities, but the way a person passes along this path is a very individual experience. I think they should say on what they focus, what is actual for them and what they develop for themselves in this kind of work.

**Elvira Shpaltakova**, 3<sup>rd</sup> year student of Faculty of primary education MSPU (presented her stage work at the first part of the seminar): If I understood your question correctly, in our work we do not focus on the personality or on the psychology of a person because this kind of approach can hurt the person. We don’t go deep into that. Maybe for someone this is important, maybe someone focuses on these things individually, and maybe someone concentrates on his personal growth, but our work basically, in its core, is not aimed at this.

**Vesta Loginova**, 2<sup>nd</sup> year student of Faculty of primary education MSPU (presented her stage work at the first part of the seminar): As far as personal growth is concerned, I think that it is happens more

like side effect. Throughout this practice we broaden our horizons, we face new things, and in the result of the work we do, we also grow personally.

**Dmitry Leonenko**: But is it important for you? Or the other part after all, the professional part?

**Vesta Loginova**: This is a thing which I noticed on the second year of our training. At some point I saw that for myself, but it wasn't my goal, and now it's not my goal also... it is like a nice bonus, you know when in the shop they give you little presents, here it is the same. The main goal is that you can think differently, formulate your thoughts.

**Egor Zimin**, 2<sup>nd</sup> year student of Faculty of primary education MSPU (presented his stage work at the first part of the seminar): You know, in every school there is such thing as "self-governance day", when high school students take place of teachers and administration of the school. So the high school students are much better at holding the attention of the class than many of the students of the first, second or even third year of education at the pedagogical university (MPGU) just because they don't know what attention, which they should hold, is. There is more organicity in them, because they know how to "nullify" and the don't follow the pedagogical plan, which tortures all pedagogues. This practice allows to "nullify", that is the main value of this practice.

**Antonina Rostovskaya**: Main value for you?

**Egor Zimin**: Yes, for me.

**Antonina Rostovskaya**: Yes, this is very important.

**H.U. Gumbrecht**: Starting with what you were saying, this is very much a question from which angle you want to see. This is phenomena what you produced this morning and you can, of course, see from individual point of view, you can say "what did I get out of it". There is this beautiful old German word "bildung", which is more than education, it is character formation. As you were saying whatever you do, everything is character formation, good one or bad one, but whatever you do is character formation.

You can also see what was being performed this morning as a show. If I were from southern California, from Hollywood, I would think would it worth bringing them to Hollywood and produce a show with them. There's nothing wrong with that, you can see that. I was trying mainly and automatically to speak from an angle of a curriculum, I mean, this is being taught at a university as a part of a curriculum, in managerial skills, managerial science. And in that context, but I'm not saying it is the only angle, I think what struck me, is very productive, is how you constitute sociability. By doing what you are doing you produce sociability, that in the first place could be an important skill for any management, actually. Let me give you an example. When my doctorate students go on the job market

in US they always have to do the interviews, and my colleagues endlessly try to teach them methodology of how to do an interview, a job interview. I don't do that, because this is a part of your social skills. You talk with somebody, if I didn't know Ksenia (Ksenia Golubovich, translator of the seminar), and we talked for the first time and whether we get into a consensus, into an interesting conversation depends very much on the social skills we have. In that sense, what I found interesting from a curriculum point of view, was precisely very innovative, and as far as I'm concerned, productive, function of what you are doing, of producing sociability. And I was not referring to managerial career, but I was referring to the specific cultural situation today. This was what I meant when I said in my language, in my terminology, that you have managed this morning to transform us into mystical body. I mean a mystical body is something in which consensus, for example, occurs easier than in very formal and contentious relationship. In that sense it would also be good if our politicians have more of that talent.

So finally I want to say, there is not one single truth of what you are doing, what function that has depends on the angle. And then secondly, I want to insist that if you look at it from the question of a potential contribution to a career in management science, and maybe it is no different from a pedagogy really, then I think what impressed me the most is the production of sociability. This is why I said that there is no stage, no curtain, you have to produce it each time. And it has been very very impressive. And as a footnote I want to say that, but that would be my angle, it was also absolutely fabulous from an angle of aesthetic experience. And aesthetic experience does not need to have any other function like aesthetic experience, it was a pleasure to watch.

**Elena Korenevskaya** (participator of "TOT" Theater laboratory of method): My question is about interaction, when you were talking about your impression of what you saw – you said that the people in the room became participators of the performance, and you said that we, physically were in this event, however the audience remained just spectators, and the people who were on the stage remained actors, as people who are making an act. I thought so. How is ours, the audience's, participation achieved, except the fact that we spend our time on watching what is presented today, in your opinion mister Gumbrecht?

**H.U. Gumbrecht**: Obviously we did not participated in what was going on the stage, and obviously you could also imagine us being there, in the same space, and not participate at all, I mean we didn't participate on stage, there is no "stage" here. But I had the feeling that, especially in the second half, when we were getting used to it, it is not a question of quality, may be rhythm question on the side of the audience, that sometimes I was like when you watch sports event, you sometimes spontaneously try to do the movement that a forward would have - to shoot the ball, or stopped the ball. Like when we are at a musical event, I was mentioning the class for music that is not allowed that we moved our bodies, it is horrible, but I do it anyway. In that sense I felt that we became increasingly a part of what was being performed without having to act. I will give you one example that I wanted to talk about, but didn't have time. We do at Stanford every Thursday night something that is called "philosophical reading group". So that is not a seminar, nobody can take it for credit, and the colleague and I will convey it, we get a room and conduct a discussion, we don't count it for a teaching. We meet every Thursday, at 6.30, every trimester, we read one classical philosophical text, very slowly, 10 sessions, sometimes 10 pages per week, but you have to be well prepared. Last semester we were reading Schelling and there were 45 people. Amongst those 45 people, I would say 25 at some point participated in that discussion, 5-10 really carried the discussion, and half of them was sitting there. Now, as it is not a class, if this were a class or a seminar I would feel obliged to do my best to make everybody speak, because that's the part of the grade you give, that's also what they should learn, but as this is not a seminar I never tell the

people they have to speak, they can be there. The point I want to make is although they do not speak, by what the French call “le bon écoute” - good listening, by being there, by sacrificing their entire Thursday evening just to be there listening people doing philosophy, by sharing the space with you, they are, for me, a very important part up to the point I miss them when they don’t come, I know their faces, they are part of what is going on. So being part of the sociability doesn’t mean that everybody has the same function. The example is obvious, there are certain clubs, and certain teams at certain stadiums, who have a famously good crowd at the stadium. You may have heard of Liverpool. Liverpool can play horrible, the stadium is always full, the fans are very fateful, and they sing this famous song “You will never walk alone”. And there are other stadiums, like Manchester City in the English league, where this doesn’t happen. Manchester City is actually normally better than Liverpool, but this doesn’t happen. In that sense I feel in the performance, like today, I founded successful, and I admired it, and I felt engaged by it because it managed to make me part of what was going on although I was behaving very much like these students who come to the philosophical reading group and do not speak.

**Elena Korenevskaya** (participator of “TOT” Theater laboratory of method, assistant at the Laboratory of stage practices in Moscow State Pedagogical University): What is becoming with the presence, with the performance if we extract the audience “le bon écoute”?

**H.U. Gumbrecht:** Well, the answer I’m almost obliged to give, and I hope the performers will support me, will be - it would not be so good. If you are a fan of any sports and you hope that your support of your team, that it matters to your team that you are there, that you don’t leave early, I never leave the game before it is over, I hate people who leave, it is 5-0 and then they leave. If you do that you can just check out the score on the Internet. I stay there.

I would really be interested to hear from the performers, from a functional point of view, the presence of the audience “le bon écoute” makes possible something that is not possible if you simply have actors. My impression is, and I will give you one example, that the presence of the audience “le bon écoute” improves your performance. If you have the impression that the people are listening, when I have the impression the people are following, they doesn’t have to agree, but something is going on, you, of course, naturally become a better speaker, unless you are just reading a printed text, but nobody should ever read a printed text, because a printed text you can buy as a book, or you can read as manuscript, you can download on the Internet. In that sense once again, I’m not saying you could not perform your performance without the presence of people being there, but: a) I do feel, from my own experience as a performer lecturer, it makes your quality a difference; and b) also, and above all, i think that is what really happens in that type of performance. I mean, we are now still together, after more than 7 hours, 9 hours, that now I think is the best moment of listening, this is not just because Ksenia and I are doing this wonderful job. This started this morning and I will not forget it.

**Igor Kalinovsky** (participator of “TOT” Theater laboratory of method, performer in “From the life of chronopios and famas”, assistant at the Laboratory of stage practices in Moscow State Pedagogical University): Thank you very much for your speech and your reaction.

I will start with answering the question that Hans directed to the performers, of whether the audience is important, how much it influences what we do, and answering that question I would like to go to the question that bothers me, but that I cannot completely formulate. But maybe in the process of answering to your question I will try to formulate my own.



About the audience and the influence of the audience on the performing - of course it affects, and of course something goes on when you start to act, when you pro-du-ce (“pro-du-cere”, Heidegger) your action, but there is a very important moment, for example, on the repetition, the thing you perform can be much stronger than when you are on the stage. And here is the question I want to go to, about our practice, our work, and the institutionalization of it - in our work we focus on discovering the boundaries, the limitations in the action of every one of the people performing, finding new perspective for the action, new resources, independently of the outside situation, because, of course, the situation in which you are, affects you, but one of the questions is what to do and how it is possible for every individual person not to. So my question is - did you, as a spectator, saw in this kind of performance, not only the final form, but also how this form was developed? And that the final form is not so important as the path, through which this form has been developed?

**H.U.Gumbrecht:** I see two functions, they are intertwined, they are not separated. Antonina today in the morning said that this seems to be the main justification for having your contribution in the curriculum of this university, she said it helps people to experience, to find out what they can play with. You need at some point to speak in public to know if you have a good voice or bad voice, even technically - how far your voice carries, you need to know whether you are good at performing in the rhythm and so forth. So, in that sense, it helps you individually and yet I would say, not only at a day like today, when you have more audience than you normally do in a classroom, but even in the classroom, where not everybody always acts at the same time, that’s why your group today - there is 2 people, 3 people performing, at no moment there were everybody performing - so you always already have a performance. And I would say whether you plan that or not, the constitution of a social body is an inevitable side product of what you are doing, whether you want that or not. When I’m saying “a side product” I’m not speaking of a product “oh, now you have constituted the audience, and now it’s finished”, no, of course the audience constantly changes. It changes in one class from week to week, it has to be enormously changing over the day, as I was saying five minutes ago, this situation in which we are in now, is partially a product of this morning, and it never really stops. This day will stop, but you guys will come together again, I very much hope that you invite me again back to Moscow one day. I told you yesterday I have a wild idea of bringing you together with a group of Copenhagen.

So yes, I very emphatically agree with you, and I would say that about humanities in general. I mean the value of the humanities in general lies much more in the process than in the end result. Even for me, I’ve written my share of books in my life, and they are all on the shelf at home, and that’s nice, but the process of writing a book was endlessly more important to me, like I hope for the people who read my books, the process of reading the book is the real experience, and not the notes that I’m taking. So I agree with all of that, but that doesn’t mean that you have only the perspective of your personal growth. I do think that inevitably in such a process you produce a social body, you produce sociability, but the way I’m saying it is treacherous, because it is not just that final social body, it is a social body, to use as a metaphor, that can grow like a physical body.

**Mihail Veselinov** (participator of “TOT” Theater laboratory of method, performer in “From the life of chronopios and famas ”, assistant at the Laboratory of stage practices in Moscow State Pedagogical University): You said that, as you see it, an Event is created in sports by presence and by rules. In our performance, you said, that the eventness is created also by presence and by rhythm. Do you know any other spaces, spheres, where the eventness is created by other resources, other things, that helps creating the Eventness?

**H.U. Gumbrecht:** This is very very interesting. I think in sociology, not empirical sociology, but what they call MaxWeberian-sociology, there is this basic elementary assumption of double contingency. So if you start interacting with somebody, I also don't like the concept of interaction normally, but we just use it for simplicity, so if you interact with somebody you don't know how the person will act, and the other person doesn't know how you will act, and you know that the other person doesn't know how you will act and so forth - that is what is called double contingency. So I would say, that in that sense, any human interaction that is going on, that can be each time when you are in metro and go by somebody, you may say "hello", you may make an eye contact or not, I mean already that is double contingency thing. If you are bound with somebody to have a long term relationship, that can be you and your doctor, that can be you and your teacher, that can be you and your student etc. , so you have to build, well you don't have to build, but you normally build certain forms, and that what we call an institution. Institution starts with two people. So you and I since yesterday, and Antonina and I since yesterday, and Igor and I since yesterday, we have already started going by a habitualization, into institualization.

Beside having predefined form...in order for any type of interaction not to have to be invented each time. So we now know we have already interacted, and I know you speak English well and we don't have to translate, and so forth and so forth. In order for us not to have to start each time we always need a form. The question is not so much whether it is a form or a rhythm, the question is how the form is produced. Now, in what we call games, not only soccer games, also card games, any kind of games, whatever we call a game, there is predefined set of rules. If you are interested there is very very interesting essay by Gregory Bateson, I don't know whether anyone knows him in Russia, about two types of games - one type where you have preset rules, and other games, like children games, where the rules are emerging as they are playing. Secondly, I was already saying, I would say rhythm, to establish a rhythm, is a way to regulate interactions. That is not only a rhythm between two persons, what we call, for example, "the church year" is a rhythm like that - Easter comes back every year, Christmas comes back every year, certain holidays come back every year. So that is the form of interaction between many. I mean there are 1,2 billion Catholics on this planet, amongst them about maybe 300 million are practicing, that's pretty large. So that is a rhythm.

I would finally speculate, and the philosopher to read would be Nietzsche and Freud, that another way of providing a form is the energy of desire. For example, I'm back on sex, in a case where there is a high level of energy of desire in both sides, you have a certain interactions going on, you don't have to explain each time "Oh, you know, this is the fourth Sunday in the month we're going to have sex", you can presuppose when you see the person you want to have sex with him, if the level is very high.

Then there are asymmetrical cases of energy that you have to find a form in between, and so forth and so forth.

Instead of making even longer story let me stop here and say: it is always about the production of form, there is always a form involved, the difference is how the form is being produced; I definitely think there is larger variety than predefined form and form produced by rhythm, so I would, for example, say that the proportions will be different level of energy can be such a thing.

As it is late of the day, there is no other possibility coming to my mind, but I think there is definitely more than 3.